

REMARKS

Review and reconsideration of the non-final Office Action mailed July 2, 2010 (the "Office Action"), is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Although no additional fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any surplus to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-10 were pending. All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and/or 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 6 and 8 are amended, claims 2, 5, 7 and 10 are canceled, and new claims 11 and 12 are added. No new matter is added.

The amendments presented herein have been made solely to expedite prosecution of the instant application to allowance and should not be construed as an indication of Applicants' agreement with or acquiescence to the Examiner's position. Accordingly, Applicants expressly maintain the right to pursue broader subject matter through subsequent amendments, continuation or divisional applications, reexamination or reissue proceedings, and all other available means. The amendments and rejections are addressed below in more detail.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action asserts that the drawings, Figure 1 in particular, fail to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5). A replacement sheet including Figure 1 accompanies this Amendment. As suggested by the Examiner, Figure 1 has been revised so that the cooking oil and the film are labeled with reference characters (2) and (7), respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the replacement drawings overcome the objections raised in the Office Action and respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Amendments to the Claims

By this Amendment, independent claim 1 is amended to add the subject matter of dependent claims 2 and 5. Support for this amendment is located throughout the Specification, including without limitation, page 4, lines 8-9 and 25-26 and original claims 2 and 5.

By this Amendment, claim 6 is amended to depend from claim 1. Support for this amendment is located throughout the Specification, including without limitation, page 5, lines 11-21 and original claims 7 and 10.

By this Amendment, new claims 11 and 12 are added. Support for these amendments is located throughout the Specification, including without limitation, page 4, line 8 - page 5, line 8. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,155,319 by Chiu (hereinafter “Chiu”). By this amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended to add the subject matter of claims 2, 5, 7 and 10, which are not subject to this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection based on Chiu be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,559,481 by Truesdell (hereinafter “Truesdell”) in view of Chiu.

Truesdell is drawn to a grease composition which is especially applicable for use by bakers in greasing baking pans. Truesdell, Abstract. The grease composition constitutes an oleaginous, *i.e.* oily, product. Truesdell, col. 3, ln. 35-37. Truesdell discloses a greasy coating that contains oil, lecithin and beeswax. Truesdell, col. 1, ln. 55 – col. 2, ln.1-3. The oil is comprised of either mineral oil, vegetable oil, or a mixture of both. *Id.* Among them, the mineral oil is not cooking oil. Truesdell discloses the mixture of not only oil, but also lecithin and beeswax. Additionally, both lecithin and the beeswax may be used for foods, but neither is included within the category of cooking oil. In contrast, the film of the claimed method is formed from *cooking oil only*.

Furthermore, Truesdell fails to disclose or suggest forming a gelatinous film and, as acknowledged in the Office Action, Truesdell also fails to disclose or suggest bringing a surface of the oil into contact with a flame. In contrast, *the claimed method includes bringing a surface of the*

cooking oil applied onto the surface of the base into contact with a flame, wherein the gelatinous film is formed only from cooking oil. Therefore, the claimed method is clearly distinguished from Truesdell.

Chiu is drawn to a heat-conducting film for absorbing electromagnetic waves and microwave energy. Chiu, Abstract. Chiu discloses that the coating film is formed by burning the film onto the base at a high temperature of 850 °C. Chiu, col. 1, ln. 36-38, 57-60; col. 3, ln. 6-10. Therefore, Chiu fails to disclose or suggest the claimed method including *bringing a surface of the cooking oil applied onto the surface of the base into contact with a flame, wherein the gelatinous film is formed* for forming. Additionally, Chiu fails to correct the deficiencies of Truesdell identified above.

Furthermore, the coating film disclosed in Chiu is not intended to peel an object to be treated from a base easily. As clearly shown in Figure 5, the object to be treated contacts the inside of a utensil 7 without contacting the coating film 10. Chiu, Fig. 5. On the other hand, the coating film 10 contacts the outside of the utensil 7. *Id.* In addition, the coating film 10 is stuck to the surface of the ceramic utensil or glass utensil, and is not intended to be peeled from the surface thereof. *See id.* at col. 3, ln. 6-11, 27-30. Further, the protecting coat 3, which is applied over the film, is not expected to be capable of being peeled as is clearly shown by its wording “protecting coat.” *See id.* at col. 3, ln. 15-24. Thus, Chiu teaches away from the film of the claimed method.

The claimed method, including bringing a surface of the cooking oil applied onto the surface of the base into contact with a flame wherein the gelatinous film is formed only from cooking oil, results in the unexpectedly superior peeling properties of the resulting film. As discussed above, the film according to the claimed method is intended to peel the object to be treated from a base easily, with the film contacted by the object to be treated. The claimed method can achieve such remarkable operation and effect, which would not be expected from the combination of Truesdell and Chiu, because the base has an excellent peeling property relative to an object to be treated due to the peeling property being achieved when the base contacts the object through the film. Neither of the cited references disclose or suggest such peeling properties.

In summary, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the claimed method, which includes applying cooking oil onto a surface of a base and bringing a surface of the cooking oil applied onto the surface of the base into contact with a flame, wherein the gelatinous film is formed only from cooking oil. In addition, the claimed method results in greater than expected peeling properties because the film is in a gelatinous state and the surface of cooking oil being brought into contact with a flame.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that all rejections based on combination of Truesdell and Chiu be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, the independent claims are believed to be allowable. In addition, the dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependence on an allowable base claim and for further features recited therein. The application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. If any issues remain outstanding, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned (561-847-7806) if it is believed that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

NOVAK DRUCE + QUIGG LLP

Date: October 4, 2010

/s/ Karen C. Kline

J. Rodman Steele, Jr., Reg. No. 25,931
Gregory M. Lefkowitz, Reg. No. 56,216
Karen C. Kline, Reg. No. 59,907
City Place Tower
525 Okeechobee Blvd., Fifteenth Floor
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Phone: (561) 847-7800
Fax: (561) 847-7801

Docket No. 1625-202